



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/539,269

12/19/2005

Harold Keith Braid

231/1/146

9291

170 7590 07/10/2009

RICHARD M. GOLDBERG
25 EAST SALEM STREET
SUITE 419
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

EXAMINER

TANG, JEFF

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3634

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/539,269 | Applicant(s) BRAID ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Jeff Tang | Art Unit 3634 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeff Tang. (3) Jerry Redman.

(2) Rich Goldberg. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 08 July 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Guillemet et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possible amendments regarding claim 1. Agreed that applicant must rewrite the claim to be more specific to the structure of the invention. Discussed the method claim 14 and whether Guillemet et al. inherently describes the method or not. Agreed that adding more structure to the method claims could possibly make it distinguishable over the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| | /KATHERINE W MITCHELL/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3634 |
|--|--|